

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,748	02/11/2002	Michael S. Hibbs	BUR920010135	5595
23550	7590 11/13/2003		EXAM	INER
	WARNICK & D'ALES	NGUYEN, HUNG		
3 E-COMM SQUARE ALBANY, NY 12207		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2851	

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/683,748	HIBBS, MICHAEL S.
,, ,	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hung Henry V Nguyen	2851
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondenc address
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS API Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this 1) a timely filed amendmer	application. A proper reply to a twhich places the application in
PERIOD FOR R	REPLY [check either a) or b)]
 a)	s Advisory Action, or (2) the date set later than SIX MONTHS from the AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH	e mailing date of the final rejection. S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date o (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Off timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	l of extension and the correspond of the shortened statutory period fi ffice later than three months after	ing amount of the fee. The appropriate extension reply originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	because:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	her consideration and/or se	arch (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by	materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	eling a corresponding numb	er of finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s);	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	· · · 	in a separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOI	ELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•	
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1,3-6,8,11 and 18-20</u> .		
Claim(s) objected to: 16 and 21-24.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>12-15,17 and 19</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a) approved or b)	disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme		
10. Other:	(5)(
TO.L. Suiter.		Marchecum
		BENEVA SANCONO. HENSA HANG KETARI

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01) A 3 "

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection under the prior art of Iwasaki and Eynnon have been carefully reviewed but they are not found to be persuasive. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's arguments since the limitations of claims 12-15, 17 and 19 are met under the prior a of Iwasaki and Eynon under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as set forth in the previous office action. For example, in the broadest sense, the upper portion of frame (42) (see fig.1) can be regarded as "an aerodynamic fairing" as claimed.